

## NSTIC Pre-Plenary Event 3/15

### Management Council, Plenary, Committee, and Working Group Roles and Participation

#### Synopsis

##### Summary:

Discussion during this session focused primarily on five topics; Education/communication, Scope of steering group work, the relationship between the Steering Group, the NPO, and the Secretariat, and Stakeholder Groups. There was also limited discussion needed to clarify the role of the Secretariat.

Several commenters expressed that communication, education, and outreach to the end user communities must be a core principle of the Steering Group. It was suggested that a Standing Committee be established in the Steering Group to focus strictly on filling this role. It was also expressed that the flow of information should go both ways. It is important to make sure that average citizens are aware of the Steering Group and NSTIC purpose and solutions and that the Steering Groups should also work to seek and incorporate input from citizens into their solutions.

There was broad-based discussion on the Scope of the Steering Group's work regarding standards, assessment and accreditation, and the Steering Group and Committee relationship with existing standards development organizations. These are issues that will require more detailed discussion as the Steering Group develops. There were considerable comments and questions raised on the role the NPO and the Steering Group will play in managing the Secretariat. Some of the discussion raised financial and management issues (e.g. what happens if the Secretariat/Steering Group need to modify planned activities); commenters also expressed raised input that they would like considered in the Secretariat Service selection process.

Finally, there was discussion about the stakeholder groups and the Management Council selection process may be difficult to establish and complete once the Steering Group convenes.

| Discussion Points/Decisions |  |  |
|-----------------------------|--|--|
| No.                         | Topic                                  | Discussion/Decisions   |
| 1.                          | Communications and Education           | Participants agreed that communications, Education, and outreach are absolutely essential to the success of the Steering Group and Identity Ecosystem as a whole and felt there was not enough attention paid to this topic in the Recommendations paper.  |
|                             |  | One participant stated that processes to provide and receive input from everyday citizens are absolutely essential to receiving broad buy in from the individual user. If citizens are not brought into the process and discussion there will be no trust. This is particularly important considering the fact that the Federal Government will be funding the effort.           |
|                             |  | Several commenters expressed that there should be a Standing Committee focused specifically on Education, Communication, and Outreach.   |
|                             |  | A participant stated that those who do not understand what NSTIC intends to do are not just conspiracy theorists and “kooks” and should not be written off, but educated.  |
|                             |  | A participant stated that some sectors feel as if they have had significant success in educating their constituents; this requirement should be something the stakeholders and members take on through their own efforts. No one knows their constituents better than the stakeholders.  |
|                             |  | In the report, the only mention of outreach is through the role of ombudsman. There is general opinion that this is not an appropriate role for that position. One participant suggested that since this is an operational aspect of the Steering Group it may adversely impact the independence of the position.  |
|                             |  | A participant suggested that the Secretariat should take on the communications role. The Secretariat will have the money and all the other members of the Steering Group will essentially be volunteers. It was further suggested that the FFO should be updated to make clear that this needs to start immediately and should be part of all proposals.                         |
|                             |  | A participant stated that the Stakeholders have money as well and perhaps the Communications Committee (if created) could go to the Stakeholders and work with them to pay for and develop outreach plans. The participant also supported the previous assertion that the marketing of Stakeholder products and services will be a key component of communication and education. |
| 2.                          | Scope/Operations of the Steering Group | The group discussed whether the Steering Group will “create” standards and actually conduct the accreditation process (through the accreditation working group) or if they will bless off on third party entities and existing standards groups to do this work.   |
|                             |  | This was not addressed in the paper. The paper was only intended to lay out the elements the NPO saw as essential in and Identity Ecosystem Steering Group. The actual operations and functioning will be an essential part of the conversation going forward.   |
|                             |  | One participant stated the Steering Group will have to develop a core and hierarchy for this accreditation/testing/evaluation process if it is going to succeed.   |

| Discussion Points/Decisions                          |       |   |
|--|-------|---|
| No.  | Topic | Discussion/Decisions  |
|  |       | Some participants suggested that reviewing the entities and the processes that exist today and determining how they can be included in the process will be an important step in the process of establishing the operations of the Steering Group.   |
|  |       | A participant stated the Steering Group should establish a baseline of requirements and work through existing entities for accreditation and standards adoption.  |
|  |       | One participant noted that there was no mention of the work plan/workflow of the Steering Group in the paper and that is an important aspect of this group that has not been addressed.   |
|  |       | The paper focused on the essential elements of the Steering Group. The workflow and work plans should be part of the ongoing discussion.  |
| 3. Secretariat                                       |       | A participant noted that the recommendations report is the primary reference for the Secretariat FFO and wanted to know if, given the discussion today, modifications to the recommendations paper would be made.   |
|  |       | The recommendations paper represents just that -- recommendations. However, as these are recommendations it is expected that there will be modifications when the Steering Group is actually convened by the Private sector. . As long as the proposed changes do not violate the fundamentals of the paper there will be no push back from the NPO.  |
|  |       | A participant hoped that that any candidate would review the outputs from this event and from the collaboration that follows (the participant suggested this would happen on NSTIC.us) in the creation of their proposals for the Secretariat Position. It was also suggested a good candidate should be feeling the pulse of the community. It was also stated by the participant that there should be an amendment to the FFO that points candidates to places where they can gain information from meetings like this. |
|  |       | The Secretariat will be selected according to established NIST Grant procedures. Each proposal will be reviewed and graded by a minimum of three reviewers and by the Selecting Official, Jeremy Grant. The final decision will then be made by Jeremy.   |
|  |       | The authority, or power, of the secretariat derives from the ability to set the agenda for the steering group and enforce the operating principles. They are responsible for allowing the Steering Group to meet these principles through the fulfillment of their administrative responsibilities.   |
| 4. Steering Group, NPO, and Secretariat Relationship |       | Participants raised discussion on who will manage the Secretariat – the NPO or the Steering Group/Management Council.   |
|  |       | The initial operations will be a shared operation between the Steering Group and the NPO. The Federal Government is funding the Secretariat FOR the Steering Group and decisions regarding the management roles will have to be collaborative between the NPO and the Steering Group. The NPO has responsibilities to the Department of Commerce grants process. However, the workplans established through discussion will have a significant impact on the Secretariat's activities.                                    |
|  |       | A participant suggested that the governance of the Secretariat will be very important and felt that how this will be accomplished is still unclear. It was  |

| Discussion Points/Decisions                  |       |  |
|--|-------|--|
| No.  | Topic | Discussion/Decisions   |
|  |       | suggested that without the proper oversight, the Secretariat could turn the Identity Ecosystem into a business and we do not want that to happen.  |
|  |       | This is the same model that was used by SGIP. The NPO Director will be part of the Management Council which will give the Management Council a tool to ensure the Secretariat is meeting the requirements and goals they have set forth.   |
|  |       | Participant's felt it was unclear if the Secretariat could manage funds collected by the Steering Group from outside the government.   |
|  |       |  |
| 5. Management Council and Stakeholder Groups |       | Management Council delegates will be elected by general election of the Stakeholder Groups. There will be one from each Stakeholder Group to ensure that all Stakeholder Groups, large or small, will have the same number of votes in the Management Council. This will be a representational body. It is the sole reason that the stakeholder groups were developed. Steering Group members self-identify to a single stakeholder group.   |
|  |       | A participant stated that the Stakeholder Groups are artificial and will alienate potential stakeholders. The participant suggested that this model will work to limit potential over-representation on the management council, but it will not work for the actual election of members. It was suggested that members should be able to vote for all delegates of the management council. There are election models that exist today that can be adapted to allow a broader level of participation in the election while still maintaining a small manageable body (i.e. Single Parcel Voting). |
|  |       | The Secretariat will convene the initial meeting of the stakeholders. This model worked with SGIP and with HITSP.  |
|  |       | The Management Councils of both HITSP and SGIP were elected at the first meeting of these groups.  |
|  |       | Like all aspects of this report, the Stakeholder Groups are simply recommendations. As long as the fundamental concepts of the recommendations are observed, changes can be made, if necessary.  |
| 6. Misc.                                     |       | A participant stated that calling the overall group (Plenary and Management Council) a Steering Group is inaccurate and misleading.  |
|  |       | Some members of the group felt that an interim group should be created to work these issues until a permanent structure can be decided upon.   |
|  |       | The private sector and industry are not the same.  |